HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 46 Saturday, November 17, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Rolling Thunder Over Europe: "The crisis in Europe is by far the gravest in that continent since World War II" — such is the verdict given to HUMAN EVENTS by the best intelligence source we know.

Anxious attention and study are given to several points, as follows:

(1) A Soviet military build-up of forces — already quite formidable — goes on continuously. This expansion is far more than sufficient to maintain order or to crush such revolts as that in Hungary.

(2) Russia, instead of evacuating the unfortunate Hungary, is actually reinforcing her troops there.

(3) Nearly half-a-million Russian troops are in East Germany. That's more than is necessary merely to keep down any rebellious Germans.

(4) "Watch Tito" — see how nervous he is. At first he made noises of sympathy when the Hungarian revolt showed some signs of success. Then, with the crushing of that revolt, he piped down. In the last few days, he again offered criticisms of Soviet policy towards Hungary. Tito knows the mind of Moscow better than any Westerner.

All this — in the opinion of experts — does not mean that the Russians are going to move westward to the Channel, against Britain and France. But the worst of it is — admit these observers — that we cannot be certain that the Russians are not going to do so.

But what really gets "the wind up" of these watchers, as they seek to read intentions behind such developments as the continuing Soviet military build-up in Eastern Europe, is that they don't really know which gang is running the show for the Kremlin.

No one can guess what the bibulous duo, Khrushchev and Bulganin, will do. But speculation on that pair is easy and relaxing in comparison with deciphering what is going to happen if Molotov and his clique are taking over the helm (as some reports suggest). Some exasperated specialists actually would prefer to have Stalin back; at least in that case, they would have some inkling about the coming course of Moscow. But how can you read intentions when you don't know who's boss?

Now all this has had a deeper impact on official Washington than just on experts poring over maps. Among civilians who get about in informed circles, there is a belief that our Strategic Air Command has been completely alerted, that nuclear weapons are being distributed and anti-aircraft placed on 24-hour alert.

Old Fire Horses: Symptoms of the "war emergency" psychology fly thick and fast in Washington this week. General Alfred Gruenther was named head of the American Red Cross — an appointment that was interpreted as a "fix-up," probably at the request of the President. Mr. Eisenhower, it is said, would like to have a valuable former aide like Gruenther near at hand and available at any time, "if things get bad."

Gruenther previously had reportedly been interested in taking a prominent job in an industrial firm, but the other day, on accepting the Red Cross position, he remarked, "In times like these, it is more appropriate that I remain in public service." Gruenther left his post as European commander in Paris this week with a stern warning to the USSR of the might of American military forces.

Along the same lines was the report — later denied — that General Walter Bedell ("Beedle") Smith would take a job as assistant to the President. Smith, an old friend and comrade of the President, served under the Truman administration in high posts. He is a close friend of Mrs.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anna Rosenberg, a left-wing Democrat (and ardent supporter of Adlai Stevenson), also a big wheel in the Truman administration. It may be that someone in the White House decided that Smith's association with the Democratic administration rendered him less acceptable just now.

"Beedle" has held a big job in private business in the last two years. Whatever he will do now, talk of his return to the Government fits in with the "emergency atmosphere."

Finally, it has been noted that Mr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, has been more frequently than usual in and out of the surcharged atmosphere of the White House the past ten days. Flemming is the man who would arrange economic controls in case a real emergency should develop. He is, besides Defense Mobilizer, also one of the five members of the all-powerful body which decides on our defense strategy, the National Security Council. The other members are President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Dulles, and Secretary of Defense Wilson. Flemming is an old-time bureaucratic veteran of the Roosevelt and Truman regimes.

News from the Danube: The measures taken to bring some thousands of Hungarian refugees into the U. S. are not a part of a scheme to circumvent the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, as rumored in some circles. It is true that, on such occasions, various un-American groups seek to do this. But, in this case, the refugees are being handled strictly in accordance with the provisions of the immigration law. They are to enjoy "parole" status, offering them temporary refuge, but not actually giving them a visa. The ease with which this has been managed is cited as testimony to the fact that the McCarran-Walter Act does have exceptions to take care of humanitarian cases — a fact that un-American groups have sought to deny in the past.

The rush to bring these refugees to the U. S. as soon as possible springs from the fact that the Austrian Government, where most of these refugees are at present, fears that the Russian armored divisions might violate Austrian sovereignty and roll westward, capturing these unfortunates. The Austrians are proud to harbor these refugees from tyranny, but they do not want any trouble with the Bear.

'Modern Republicanism': Ike at his press conference three days ago said the voters split the ticket and gave Congress control to the Democrats because they don't think "modern Republicanism is going to be the guiding philosophy" of the GOP.

If this statement is the beginning of a drive to make the GOP over into a facsimile of Ike's Welfare State philosophy, the argument about this being the lesson of the election finds few buyers in the Capital. Interpretations of the elections vary considerably and there is even one line of thought — best expressed by the veteran Hearst man, George Rothwell Brown — that "local interests" alone, in varying forms, decided the outcome of the balloting.

One point of view prevalent among Midwesterners here is, paradoxically, best voiced by an Eastern writer, Bill Cunningham, columnist of the *Boston Herald*, (also on the radio), a powerful influence in New England. Cunningham, on the morrow of the election, said: "Contrary to the President's statement, the 'modern Republicans' went down like dominoes. Republicans and Democrats seemed to vote for Eisenhower as the preponderantly better choice to head the nation in these international times, and then split their tickets to ribbons voting mostly for Conservatives whichever their party."

Most Republican staffers on Capitol Hill agree with this interpretation. They figure that, in the Senate elections, the "liberals" won a net gain of only one seat and they dwell on the decisive defeats of such "White House hand-picked candidates" as McKay of Oregon and Langlie of Washington. What is being remarked is that, in '56 as in '54, Ike's coattails weren't very effective. Won't they be even more ineffective, when he isn't running in '60?

The great majority of the GOP Senators are of the right wing. And so it is expected that Knowland will be re-elected Leader and Bridges will again be head of the important Policy Committee. One position remains vacant, that of Chairman of the Conference Committee, left by the retiring Senator Millikin. Talk of a successor includes mention of Bricker of Ohio and Martin of Pennsylvania. However, it may be that one of the "liberals," who are few in number and low in seniority, will lay claim to this place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scab Unions: Two labor unions, both highly vociferous when employers try to block their organizational activities, find themselves on the other end of the stick, accused of unfairly refusing to recognize other unions as representing their employees. They are the United Mine Workers and the free-wheeling Teamsters Union.

The UMW finds itself picketed by two AFL-CIO unions, the Masters, Mates and Pilots Association, and the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. It's in connection with creation of American Coal Shipping, Inc., a new firm set up by a group of coal mine operators, railroads and the UMW.

Objective of Coal Shipping is to transport coal across the Atlantic at lowest possible costs. If it succeeds in expanding export coal markets, it would be a boon to all three segments involved — railroads, mine operators, and miners.

But one of the first acts of UMW boss John L. Lewis, in his new role of shipline boss, was to sign a contract covering the ships' officers with two ships' officers divisions of the UMW's sprawling catchall District 50. The two AFL-CIO Associations countered by setting up picket lines around the new line's lower Manhattan offices. They threaten dire reprisals if the line tries to function without their members.

The Teamsters Union troubles stem from its refusal to recognize a local of the Office Employees International Union as collective bargaining representative for office help in its Portland, Oregon, headquarters.

The Office Employees Union filed unfair labor practice charges with the National Labor Relations Board; but the Board, evidencing clear distaste for involvement in such inter-union warfare, declined jurisdiction in the case, saying it could see no way in which policies of the Taft-Hartley Act would be furthered by its assumption of jurisdiction.

The office workers union, seemingly emulating the Teamsters' fabled toughness, took the matter into Federal courts. This week, the Supreme Court agreed to consider and decide the case. Attachés say it is the first suit brought to the high court involving unfair labor practice charges against a labor union.

Capital comment: This is what can be expected when unions move over to the management side of the bargaining table. They find the viewpoint a bit different.

MORE ON THE ELECTION

Anti-Adlai Vote: In the early stages of the Presidential campaign, some conservatives were prepared to see Stevenson win in order to break the "liberal" hold on the GOP. However, as it came to the wire — with Stevenson moving to the left of his own left wing — the prospect of an ADA-controlled Government became too frightening, and pro-Adlai sentiment on the right dissolved. Conservatives ended up voting for Ike as the "less bad" of the two candidates. This anti-Stevenson (rather than pro-Eisenhower) mentality — according to the comments of the press — took hold of most Americans in a similar fashion, thus producing last week's "landslide." A random check of the press discloses the following election analyses:

- Dorothy Schiff, publisher of the ardently pro-Stevenson *New York Post*, saw Adlai losing because "softness *re* communism on account of the draft and H-Bomb issues incorrectly was suspected. Masses of registered Democrats unhappily voted for Eisenhower and Nixon."

- Chesly Manly, *Chicago Tribune* reporter who accompanied Stevenson throughout the campaign, wrote that Sevenson's "race for President probably will be studied by political scientists for many years as a classic example of how not to run a campaign."

- Joseph Cloud of the *Washington Daily News* highlighted Stevenson's last-minute concentration on Ike's health, estimating that "maybe voters decided Mr. Stevenson hadn't been quite truthful when he said, at the beginning of the contest, he wouldn't make Ike's health an issue."

- David Lawrence, known for his laudatory attitude toward the President, stated flatly that the vote was anti-Stevenson, rather than pro-Eisenhower: "The people — who have a habit of voting against things — cast their ballot against Adlai Stevenson, who made a campaign that fumbled the main issues."

Surveying comments such as these, some Washington observers say that beneath the exultation over Ike's "personality" lies this fact: analyses of the campaign results uniformly stress *negative* as-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pects of Stevenson — like his draft, H-Bomb, and health bloopers — rather than *positive* aspects of Eisenhower's campaign. This meant that Ike could, and did, look good merely by standing still — a contrast which produced last week's results.

Breakthrough on Two Fronts: By carrying Louisiana, say press commentators familiar with Dixie, the Republicans have finally penetrated the "Solid South." This long-heralded breakthrough is seen as a real beginning for a two-party system in the cotton belt, with Republican strength there building on a paradoxical coalition of forces: Southern pro-segregationist conservatives, who cannot stomach a Democratic party dominated by ADA, and Negro voters, impressed with the "civil rights" performance of the Eisenhower administration.

Political analysts here are frankly surprised at the swing of the Southern Negro vote into the Republican column, and are beginning to revise their own "materialist" interpretation of voting behavior. Pre-election estimates gave the Democratic promise of bigger and better Government "handouts" greater weight than the Supreme Court desegregation decision fathered by the GOP. It is now admitted in the Capital that the "prestige" allegedly conferred by that decision was a more powerful influence than Adlai's ultra-New Deal noises, as indicated by the following facts:

In Atlanta, Georgia, Eisenhower won 85 per cent of the Negro vote; in 1952, he had taken 31 per cent.

In Louisiana, Negroes voted for Eisenhower by over five to one; in 1952, the ratio was about nine to one — for Stevenson.

Throughout Texas, the Negro vote this time was three to two for Eisenhower, whereas it had been ten to one for Stevenson in 1952.

This pattern was repeated almost everywhere in the South. Additionally, the shift of Negro votes was considered to be influential in the "just inside the border" states of Tennessee, Virginia, and Florida. In other areas, specifically in the Northern cities of Detroit, Philadelphia, and Chicago — where Democratic patronage networks exert a direct influence — the shift away from Stevenson was negligible.

Declining Voter Interest: Press, radio and TV comment on the elections has made frequent use of the phrase "record turnout." The impression created by these words is one of fierce interest in the power struggles of the two parties. This impression, say those who study the election statistics, does not stand up under the light of sober fact — especially considering the foreign crises faced by the nation and the insistence of this year's get-out-the-vote drives. Voter interest, say the statisticians, has declined appreciably since 1952. They cite these facts:

With some precincts and absentee ballots still out, the final 1956 tally is estimated at almost exactly 61 million votes, against 61½ million cast in 1952. Further, as the total vote dropped by half-a-million in four years, the eligible voting population rose by almost four million (98,135,000 to 102,000,000). As a result of these fluctuations, the percentage of eligible voters who went to the polls fell by three points — from 62.7 to an estimated 59.6. In short, over 40 million eligible Americans were indifferent to whether Eisenhower or Stevenson won the election.

Letter from EDGAR W. HIESTAND, U. S. Representative, California: "I can thank HUMAN EVENTS and one other sound conservative publication for my being in Congress today. I received a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS when it was started, and have been a subscriber ever since. It has helped my thinking immeasurably."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

Bound Volumes for 1956 — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 17, 1956

Article Section

ROAD'S END FOR THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

By JAMES C. INGEBRETSEN

THE Gospel is always social. There is no force which can prevent genuine religion from seeking and finding embodiment in appropriate social forms. The institutions, conventions, laws, and morals of a people reflect the ultimate values they hold in common.

But the phrase, The Social Gospel, has acquired a meaning of its own quite different from this. It refers to a movement of the past century or so, gathering momentum in the twentieth century, which pressed for the alleviation of social ills by increasing the scope and powers of government. The social gospel movement is a first cousin to modern socialism, which purports to see in the extension of political action a remedy for war, poverty, unemployment, and a host of lesser evils.

The so-called "social gospel" then, is an effort by clergymen to apply Christianity to society, and it was evoked by genuine evils. Every society has its quota of iniquities, but here in America the earlier promise of the American dream cast the evils of the post-Civil War period in a particularly ugly light. The political scandals, the graft, the connivance of politician with financier and industrialist, the lust for easy money at all social levels, the poverty, the long hours of work, the exploitation, were all part of the American scene.

But awareness of these ugly features of our national life does not necessarily ensue accurate discernment as to the true causes of them. The social gospel declared that these evil things were the consequence of weak government and insufficient legislation. Therefore, the way to remedy these evils was by strengthening government and passing laws. The diagnosis and remedy are both open to serious question. As a matter of historical record, the American federal government in the nineteenth century intervened actively in economic life to create privilege and grant subsidies to some at the expense of others. Political interventions were accelerated in the post-Civil War period and continued on into the twentieh century. These backhanded practices began to pick up a metaphysic and a body of dogma. Their vast extension on principle was the thing called The Welfare State ushered in by the New Deal.

A GREAT MANY of the more flagrant social ills, if traced to their source, are seen to stem from an improper use of political power; government does what it should not do, or refrains from doing what it ought to do. This being the case, it would seem that any sensible effort to correct social abuses would first of all call a halt to the political interventions which were causing them. But the social gospel-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lers, like many of their contemporaries in social reform, had but one patent medicine for a sick society — more laws and a bigger government. Putting their faith in this panacea, many of them were led to affiliate with the Socialist party. By 1932 there were enough churchmen of this persuasion to form the Fellowship of Socialist Christians, with such men as Reinhold Niebuhr, John C. Bennett, and Roswell P. Barnes (now Associate General Secretary of the politically powerful National Council of Churches), and others, on its executive committee.

During the nineteen thirties resolutions were pushed through denominational and other church groups calling for the overthrow of our free enterprise system, with "the legal forms which sustain it, and the moral ideals which justify it."

The Fellowship of Socialist Christians thought they saw an inherent conflict between Christianity and "capitalistic individualism" and urged support for political parties embodying "the purposes of socialism." At its 1934 annual conference members agreed to join "a socialist party" and to contribute substantial amounts to enterprises with a social revolutionary purpose. After the recognition by our government of the Soviet Union, thousands of well-meaning, but misled, clergymen easily became involved with Communist-front operations of an unsavory character.

Social Action Departments were established and staffed under the general budget in many of the major denominations. Other social gospellers found places in the editorial rooms of religious publications, on seminary faculties, in local councils of churches, and book publishing houses. The Federal Council of Churches became, in effect, a central bureaucracy through which the activities of the social gospellers were integrated and promoted.

Dr. John C. Bennett, of powerful Union Theological Seminary, has described the extent of this penetration, by saying, "The leadership and many strategic centers, such as theological seminaries and church boards and periodicals, in most of the denominations are committed to the position that Christianity demands drastic changes in the structure of social life. The policies of the Federal Council are based on this assumption." These drastic changes, according to Dr. Bennett, are to result in "an economic order based upon the social ownership of the large sources of wealth and power."

Disdain for the "bourgeois" character of most parish clergymen and their lay members has been freely and frequently expressed by this advance guard of "prophetic witnesses." They quote with approval the gibe of a left-wing European critic that the average American Protestant church is a "bourgeois ghetto." They have been open also in proclaiming their determination to establish themselves in controlling key positions in the several ecclesiastical bureaucracies so largely created by their own hands and soon now to be ensconced in their own gigantic New York City skyscraper.

The social actionist leaders in the churches believe, as one of their number has declared, that they are called upon to "witness to the convictions of an advanced minority . . . without being chained to majority or consensus"; that they are above the "narrow class interests which unhappily characterize large segments of their denominations"; that they have "a broader perspective than the average laymen can hope to have."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE Fellowship of Socialist Christians has evolved into the organization known as Christian Action, spearheaded by Reinhold Niebuhr and Liston Pope. Christian Action seeks to "formulate strategies for concerted effort in influencing power centers" in church and community. "All of us are in a position," its executive secretary has recently stated, "and all of us can get ourselves into a better position, to advance our common convictions through the religious institutions to which we have direct access."

Social actionists have made clear their purpose to use the political prestige and leverage of thirty-five million or so lay members (whom they claim to represent) as a mighty instrument to achieve a political reorientation of our economic life.

"The churches of Christ in the United States are committed to the establishment of a world political order." This from Mr. Walter Van Kirk, executive director of the Department of International Justice and Good Will of the National Council of Churches. Mr. Van Kirk held a similar position under the old Federal Council of Churches, and thus has been for thirty years in a position to use the machinery of the churches to amplify his personal opinions on international politics.

The National Council of Churches recently accepted $200,000 from the "Phillip Murray Foundation" (financed and operated by the CIO) and large sums from other similar sources. Using these funds, will the social actionists now mobilize their organizational resources behind the economic and political objectives of the great monopoly labor unions? One certainly looks in vain through their literature for any vigorous protest against current union abuses.

But, indeed, no one who is at all familiar with the history of the Federal Council of Churches from its organization in 1908 should be surprised by labor's largesse. The followers of the social gospel have never been secretive about their programs and activities. Mr. H. F. May, in his "Protestant Churches and Industrial America," sums it up very well in his affirmation that "the fullest measure of victory (for advocates of the Social Gospel) was achieved with the organization of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908. In this federation, representing the liberal elements in all denominations, Social Gospel advocates were able to put American Protestantism officially and repeatedly on record in comparatively concrete terms as a warm supporter of labor's cause." And Dr. John C. Bennett concedes in his contribution to "Christian Values and Economic Life" that: "the large-scale economic group to which the churches during the past half century have given most support is the labor movement . . . this interest in the labor movement has been characteristic of the national leaders of the denominations, of the Federal Council of Churches, and of others who have been most articulate in interpreting Christian social ethics. It has not necessarily represented attitudes that have been dominant within the membership of the Protestant churches."

The social gospel has thus become much more than a set of ideas held by dreamy idealists for debating purposes. These men are convinced that they have stumbled on the one and only social expression of Christianity. In the minds of the social gospellers, the only alternative to their schemes is the position that Christianity is concerned with personal salvation only, that religion is a thing of pure inwardness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those who oppose them are accused of having a personal stake in poverty and exploitation. There is no admission by the social gospellers that there can be any other interpretation of the rightful application of Christianity to social problems than the one they happen to be promoting at the moment.

This situation presents a serious problem for all thoughtful Christians today. The social actionist philosophy has been outrun by events and outrun even further by much contemporary social thought. Perhaps the reason its proponents are reluctant to indulge in any serious discussion of it stems from the fear that in having an idea pried out of their minds they also should be pried out of their positions in the ecclesiastical bureaucracy.

BUT, whatever the strengths and weaknesses of the social gospel or social actionists philosophy, the first step which its proponents ought to take, in the interest of getting at the truth, is to put their ideas on the same footing as the ideas of other men. Then their philosophy can be discussed on its merits in intellectual terms in that easy give and take of ideas, out of which all sound philosophy must come.

Thus in the field of the application of Christianity to social problems there are two separate and distinct problem areas. On the one hand, there are the problems that surround the social gospel itself as a philosophy in terms of present day understanding in religion, economics, sociology, and psychology. And, secondly, there is the question of the propriety of men in positions of responsibility in the ecclestiastical structure of using this machinery for the advancement of ideas in which they themselves may strongly believe, but which for many other earnest Christians do not represent Christian social ideals at all.

These are two of the most serious problems confronting churchmen, lay and clerical, and they are the source of much discussion, confusion and controversy in denominational life and in interdenominational activities.

The easy faith of the early social gospellers in the benevolence of a paternalistic government has been shattered and chilled by the events which have rocked the West since World War I, principally the rise of the totalitarian state. Many leaders in the social actionist camp have renounced their earlier socialism in favor of a pragmatic approach to social problems. But more discerning students have come to realize that as the term is commonly used, social reform actually means the efforts of some people to improve other people by force, and that this is not the relationship between people enjoined upon us by Christianity. It is, in fact, a denial of the love commandment.

Thus, though its voice is still loudly heard, and its program vigorously pressed by the more power-conscious of its devotees, the social gospel as a philosophy has just about reached the end of a blind alley.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

James C. Ingebretsen is President of the Foundation for Social Research, 1521 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 17, California. This article — "Road's End for the Social Gospel" — is a chapter from a book, *The Kingdom Without God,* published by the Foundation for Social Research, 189 pp., Paper Bound Edition, $2.50.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED